

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2 and 5-24 are pending in the present application with claims 1, 8 and 23 having been amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1, 2, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) illustrated in Figs. 1-4; claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over AAPA in view of JP Publication No. 2001-155642 (JP '642); and claims 5 and 7-22 were allowed.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter and for discussing this application with Applicants' representative on June 22, 2004. During the discussion, comments were presented distinguishing dependent claims over the applied art. No agreement was reached pending the Examiner's further review when a response is filed. Comments presented during the discussion are reiterated below.

Claims 1, 2, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by AAPA. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 is directed to a plasma display panel in which the barriers are arranged parallel to one another between the address electrodes, and pairs of the barriers corresponding to two fluorescent layers of the R, G and B fluorescent layers are in the form

of a stripe without bridges and a pair of the barriers corresponding to the other fluorescent layer include bridges extending in a longitudinal direction of the sustaining electrodes as a discharge cell unit. Amended independent claim 23 includes similar features.

In a non-limiting example, Fig. 7 illustrates barriers 21 dividing the G and R fluorescent layers formed in a stripe without any barriers and the barriers 21 dividing B fluorescent layer include bridges 21' extending in a longitudinal direction (see also page 12, paragraph [0046]).

On the contrary, Fig. 4 illustrates each of the fluorescent layers G, B and R including fluorescent layers having bridges. That is, Fig. 4 does not illustrate fluorescent layers in a form of a stripe without bridges.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1 and 23 and each of the claims depending therefrom are also allowable.

Further, it is respectfully submitted the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over AAPA in view of JP '642 has also been overcome as claim 6 is a dependent claim.

Serial No. 10/046,285
Amdt. dated September 2, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated June 2, 2004

Docket No. RPL-0025

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David A. Bilodeau**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq.
Registration No. 36,186
David A. Bilodeau, Esq.
Registration No. 42,325

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 DYK/DAB:knv
Date: SEPTEMBER 2, 2004

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610